

REPORT

ON

NATIVE PAPERS

FOR THE

Week ending the 27th October 1894.

CONTENTS:

	Page.		Page.
I.—FOREIGN POLITICS.		(h)—General—	
Nil.		The Hindu Sub-divisional Officer of Bihar ...	867
II.—HOME ADMINISTRATION.		Lord Harris' Solapur speech ...	ib
(a)—Police—		The separation of the executive and judicial functions ...	868
Nil.		Sir Charles Elliott and the native press ...	ib
(b)—Working of the Courts—		III.—LEGISLATIVE.	
Nil.		Nil.	
(c)—Jails—		IV.—NATIVE STATES.	
Nil.		Nil.	
(d)—Education—		V.—PROSPECTS OF THE CROPS AND CONDITION OF THE PEOPLE.	
The Calcutta Madrasa ...	867	The scarcity in Faridpur ...	869
(e)—Local Self-Government and Municipal Administration—		VI.—MISCELLANEOUS.	
Mr. Luttman-Johnson and the Patna Municipality ...	ib	Insanitary condition of certain villages in the Khulna district ...	ib
(f)—Questions affecting the land—		Sir Charles Elliott and the representative of <i>Black and White</i> ...	870
Nil.		The Presidency Commissioner on the tone of the native press ...	ib
(g)—Railways and communications, including canals and irrigation—		URIYA PAPERS.	
Nil.		Nil.	
		ASSAM PAPERS.	

LIST OF NEWSPAPERS.

No.	Names of newspapers.	Place of publication.	Reported number of subscribers.	Dates of papers received and examined for the week.
BENGALI.				
<i>Monthly.</i>				
1	" Ghosak "	Khulna	
<i>Fortnightly.</i>				
2	" Bankura Darpan "	Bankura	397	
3	" Kasipur Nivási "	Kasipur, Barisál	300	
4	" Ulubaria Darpan "	Ulubaria	720	
<i>Tri-monthly.</i>				
5	" Abodh-Bodhini "	Calcutta	
<i>Weekly.</i>				
6	" Banganivási "	Calcutta	8,000	
7	" Bangavási "	Ditto	20,000	
8	" Burdwán Sanjivani "	Burdwan	310	
9	" Charumihir "	Mymensingh	
10	" Chinsura Vártávaha "	Chinsura	500	
11	" Dacca Prakásh "	Dacca	2,400	
12	" Education Gazette "	Hooghly	950	
13	" Hindu Ranjiká "	Boalia, Rajshahi	248	
14	" Hitavádí "	Calcutta	3,000	
15	" Murshidabad Hitaishi "	Murshidabad	
16	" Murshidábád Pratínidhi "	Berhampore	
17	" Pratikár "	Ditto	608	
18	" Rāngpur Dikprakásh "	Kakinia, Rangpur	170	
19	" Sahachar "	Calcutta	800-1,000	
20	" Samaj-o-Sáhitya "	Garibpore, Nadia	1,000	
21	" Samaya "	Calcutta	4,000	
22	" Sanjivani "	Ditto	4,000	
23	" Sansodhini "	Chittagong	
24	" Sāraswat Patra "	Dacca	(300-400)	
25	" Som Prakásh "	Calcutta	800	8th October 1894.
26	" Sudhakar "	Ditto	2,000	
27	" Vikrampur "	Lauhajangha, Dacca	600	
<i>Daily.</i>				
28	" Banga Vidyá Prakáshiká "	Calcutta	500	20th and 22nd to 25th October 1894.
29	" Dainik-o-Samáchar Chandriká "	Ditto	1,200	21st to 25th October 1894.
30	" Samvād Prabhákar "	Ditto	1,435	
31	" Samvād Purnachandrodaya "	Ditto	300	20th and 22nd to 25th October 1894.
32	" Sulabh Dainik "	Ditto	3,000	22nd to 24th October 1894.
ENGLISH AND BENGALI.				
<i>Weekly.</i>				
33	" Dacca Gazette "	Dacca	500-600	
HINDI.				
<i>Monthly.</i>				
34	" Bihar Bandhu "	Bankipore	500	
35	" Darjeeling Mission ke Másik Samáchar Patrika "	Darjeeling	500	
<i>Weekly.</i>				
36	" Aryávarta "	Dinapore	750	20th October 1894.
37	" Bhárat Mitra "	Calcutta	2,500	18th October 1894.
38	" Hindi Bangavási "	Ditto	10,000	
39	" Uchit Vakta "	Ditto	
PERSIAN.				
<i>Weekly.</i>				
40	" Hublul Mateen "	Calcutta	

No.	Names of newspapers.	Place of publication.	Reported number of subscribers.	Dates of papers received and examined for the week.
URDU.				
Weekly.				
41	" Akhbar-i-Al Punch " ...	Bankipore ...	750	18th October 1894.
42	" Darussaltanat and Urdu Guide " ...	Calcutta ...	300	
43	" General and Gauhariasfi " ...	Ditto ...	410	
44	" Mehre Monawar " ...	Muzaffarpur ...	150	
URIYA.				
Monthly.				
45	" Asha " ...	Cuttack ...	80	
46	" Pradíp " ...	Ditto	
47	" Samyabadi " ...	Ditto	
48	" Shikshabandhu " ...	Ditto	
49	" Taraka and Subhavártá " ...	Ditto	
50	" Utkalprabhá " ...	Mayurbhunj ...	97	
Weekly.				
51	" Dipaka " ...	Cuttack	
52	" Samvad Váhika " ...	Balasore ...	203	
53	" Uriya and Navasamvád " ...	Ditto ...	420	
54	" Utkal Dípiká " ...	Cuttack ...	450	
PAPERS PUBLISHED IN ASSAM.				
BENGALI.				
Forthnigtly.				
55	" Paridarshak " ...	Sylhet ...	480	
56	" Silchar " ...	Silchar ...	250	
57	" Srihattavási " ...	Sylhet	

II.—HOME ADMINISTRATION.

(d)—Education.

THE *Darussaltanat and Urdu Guide* of the 18th October expresses dissatisfaction at Dr. Hoernle's degrading four boys of the Entrance class within a few months of the ensuing Entrance examination, and asks the Director of Public Instruction to take steps with a view to improving the present management of the Calcutta Madrassa, which is far from satisfactory.

DARUSSALTANAT
AND URDU GUIDE,
Oct. 18th, 1894.

(e)—Local Self-Government and Municipal Administration.

2. A Bankipore correspondent of the *Sulabh Dainik* of the 23rd October says that Mr. Luttmann-Johnson does not appear to be a friend of Local Self-Government, for he is not willing that the Municipal Commissioners of Patna should have anything to do with the assessments made in that municipality by the assessor, who was appointed by the Divisional Commissioner. On learning that they were about to hear appeals against the assessments, Mr. Johnson directed them to offer their thanks to the assessor for the excellent manner in which he had discharged his duties. The Municipal Commissioners, of course, hastened to carry out his behest, and thanked the assessor. At the subsequent sitting of the Appeal Committee, one or two assessments were reduced, and the remaining appeals were rejected. An owner of a house, who has been receiving a uniform rent for five years, has been assessed to a sum much exceeding his actual income.

SULABH DAINIK,
Oct. 23rd, 1894.

(h)—General.

3. The *Darussaltanat and Urdu Guide* of the 18th October complains that some acts of the Hindu Sub-divisional Officer of the Bihar sub-division of the Patna district have caused great dissatisfaction to the local public, and regrets that a European or a Musulman officer has not been placed in charge of the sub-division.

DARUSSALTANAT
AND URDU GUIDE,
Oct. 18th, 1894.

4. The *Dainik-o-Samachar Chandrika* of the 23rd October refers to Lord Harris' Solapur speech, and remarks as follows:—

DAINIK-O-SAMACHAR
CHANDRIKA,
Oct. 23rd, 1894.

In the course of the speech His Excellency explained why he had refused the Solapur and other municipalities in the Central Dekkan the right of returning members to the local Legislative Council. In his opinion the people who hurt the religious feelings of others, desecrate their places of worship, and commit riots, are not fit to take part in the deliberations of a legislative body. These remarks are meant for the Hindus and the entire Mahratta race. Now, considering that both Hindus and Musalmans are to blame for the recent riots at Yeola and elsewhere, it was very improper for His Excellency to blame only the former. The effect of this one-sided rebuke will be to retard the establishment of good feeling in the country. Lord Harris knew that these remarks of his would irritate the Mahratta race, and so he said with exultation that he did not care for the adverse criticism of those who called him unsympathetic, and that he was anxious only to maintain his impartiality. But the writer knows how he failed in that respect while dealing with the recent religious quarrels. The strictures on his one-sided policy in dealing with these quarrels which appeared in the *Mahratta*, the *Public Opinion* and other papers have angered him, and he has insulted the Mahratta race by hinting at their past history. It has now become customary for all Provincial rulers to pay no heed to the complaints of their native subjects, especially the Hindus, and they everywhere proclaim their anti-native and anti-Hindu policy with equal defiance. Lord Harris also made a speech at Bijapur, and the reference to Musalmans contained in that speech is couched in pleasing terms, intended to soothe and humour that people. It appears from His Excellency's references to the Hindus and Musalmans in the course of his speeches, as if the latter are the original inhabitants of India and the only well-wishers of the British Government, and as if all Hindus are disloyal and new-comers in the country. Lord Harris' Solapur speech has greatly pained the writer. His policy is going from bad to worse; in all his reports and resolutions he is humouring the Musalmans and venting his spleen

on the Hindus. By acting in this way he is bringing discredit on the Maharani, Parliament, the British race, and British rule in India, as well as violating the principles of justice and fair play.

DAINIK-O-SAMACHAR
CHANDRIKA,
Oct. 24th, 1894.

5. The *Dainik-o-Samachar Chandrika* of the 24th October has the following:—

The separation of the Executive and Judicial functions.

It is with a view to securing a satisfactory administration of justice that we advocate a separation of the executive and judicial functions. The Lieutenant Governor, however, is opposed to such a separation. His Honour remarked to the agent of *Black and White*, who interviewed him, that he and his Commissioners prevented injustice beforehand by instructing the Magistrates in the way they should proceed in criminal trials, instead of leaving it to law courts to remedy such injustice when it has been done. His Honour thus contended that the appellate courts alone could not be relied upon for exercising an effective control on the administration of criminal justice.

We do not deny that the Lieutenant-Governor is a well-wisher of the people, nor do we doubt that it is only for their good that he is for keeping both judicial and executive powers in the hands of the Magistrates. Let us also grant that other officials who, like Sir Charles, urge that the Magistrates should continue to exercise judicial power do so from no other motive. But a tree should be judged by its fruits. It is notorious that judicial officers frequently do injustice simply because executive officers are able to interfere in their judicial work, that because Magistrates are vested with both executive and judicial powers, the latter powers have to yield to the former, and that injustice is done wherever Magistrates are vested with judicial powers.

Again, why should an arrangement do harm in India which does only good elsewhere? Everywhere there are appellate courts for the control of the judicial administration. Why should that arrangement then produce evil results in India? Why should not a fear of their decisions being upset on appeal prove a sufficient check upon the lower courts? That such is not the case at present is due to the present mischievous system which permits executive authorities to interfere in matters judicial. For why should judicial officers fear appellate courts when Magistrates who are censured by the High Court are praised and rewarded by Government?

Indeed, it is only reasonable that the lower courts should be directed and controlled by the higher courts. This is the arrangement which is in vogue in every other country under English rule, and which is approved and advocated by the High Court. And it is certain that this arrangement will have to be adopted by Government sooner or later.

The Lieutenant-Governor also contends that if the Magistrates are divested of their judicial functions their prestige will suffer, and competent men will not therefore seek admission into the Civil Service. So worthless an argument may become Sir Charles Elliott, but it does not certainly become the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal. Even if Magistrates are deprived of their judicial powers, many other powers will remain in their hands, and their prestige will not therefore suffer. The Collector will remain the head of the police, and the head of the police will be the virtual ruler of the district. The Divisional Commissioners have no criminal jurisdiction, but is their power less on that account than that of Magistrates? Does the Lieutenant-Governor think that the prestige of the Commissioners is due to their power of interfering in the administration of justice by Magistrates? The Lieutenant-Governor himself possesses no judicial jurisdiction. Is his prestige due to his power of controlling the judicial officers? The Judges are vested with purely judicial functions. But are not Magistrates more feared than Judges? Indeed, the Magistrate is feared not as the dispenser of criminal justice, but as the head of the police, or, in other words, he is feared not for his power of doing justice, but for his power of doing injustice. Will the Lieutenant-Governor lend his countenance to injustice in order that Magistrates may remain all-in-all?

SULABH DAINIK,
Oct. 24th, 1894.

6. The *Sulabh Dainik* of the 24th October says that it is strange that while the severest criticism of the administration in the Anglo-Indian press does not elicit a single word of protest from the officials, the native press is charged with disloyalty as soon as it takes up the cue and speaks in the same strain. It is

Sir Charles Elliott and the native press.

much to be regretted that the nearer Sir Charles Elliott is coming to the end of his term of office, the more openly is he showing himself an enemy of the vernacular newspapers. The writer would only ask Sir Charles to remember the cold apathy with which the people of these provinces saw his predecessor, Sir Rivers Thompson, leave this country for good.

V.—PROSPECTS OF THE CROPS AND CONDITION OF THE PEOPLE.

7. The *Dainik-o-Samachar Chandrika* of the 25th October has the following on the subject of the scarcity in Faridpur:—

The scarcity in Faridpur.

DAINIK-O-SAMACHAR
CHANDRIKA,
Oct. 25th, 1894.

The writer is not surprised, like many of his contemporaries in the native press, to see Government persist in its denial of the existence of scarcity in Faridpur. Such official denial of scarcity is not without precedent in this country. For instance, when scarcity broke out in Orissa, the officials denied its existence, and thereby allowed it to develop into a regular famine, which carried off a large number of people. The officials in this country want to make out that the people have no grievances or complaints. In the Bengal Council the present Lieutenant-Governor said that famine was no longer possible in India. How can there be scarcity in Faridpur after this statement of His Honour? So, the Lieutenant-Governor denied the existence of scarcity in that place in his Dacca speech, and, following his example, Mr. Luttmann-Johnson did the same thing in his administration report. But as denial in the course of reports and speeches did not put an end to the scarcity in Faridpur, the *Faridpur Suhrit Sabha* and the missionaries had to trouble their heads about it. That there was and still is scarcity in Faridpur has been clearly proved by Babu Deviprasanna Roy Chaudhuri, Secretary to the *Suhrit Sabha*. The Indian Association, relying on the statements made by the *Suhrit Sabha*, having asked Government to grant relief to the famished, the Lieutenant-Governor ordered Mr. Tute, Commissioner of Dacca, to again submit a report on the subject of the distress. Mr. Tute immediately set about an enquiry. He made a hurried journey through the district of Faridpur, and as he found that the prisoners newly admitted into the Faridpur jail were able to walk about, and that the Faridpur hospital was not full with people suffering from diseases brought on by scarcity, he concluded that there was no scarcity, and his conclusion was corroborated by police officers. He accordingly reported that there was no scarcity, and by that means humoured the Lieutenant-Governor. It is only men who know how to humour their superiors that prosper under the present régime. The virtuous Mr. Tute is not satisfied with only denying the existence of distress, but has also warned the people against sending aid for relief purposes. Surely he is an incarnation of kindness and dharma! Why go to such extremes? You may save Government money, but why are you so anxious to make the public indifferent on the subject of the distress? Surely the *Suhrit Sabha* has made no preparations for rebellion: it only wants to distribute charity among the poor, and what is it that makes you, who are a protector of the people, discourage their charity? By trying to prevent the charity Mr. Tute is doing an unrighteous act. Was it really necessary for Mr. Tute to do so much to keep the Lieutenant-Governor in good humour?

VI.—MISCELLANEOUS.

8. The *Sulabh Dainik* of the 23rd October complains of the insanitary

Insanitary condition of certain villages in the Khulna district.

condition of the villages Keuragachi, Baksa, Kakdanga, Baonia, Haonkhali, Rani, and Panchi-akhi, within the jurisdiction of the Kalaroya thana

SULABH DAINIK,
Oct. 23rd, 1894.

in the Satkhira sub-division of the Khulna district. From the commencement of the rainy season these villages become full of weeds and jungly growth, and the roads become full of mud and impassable. There is a tank at Keuragachi, but in the rainy season its water becomes so turbid as to be unfit for drinking purposes. Also, in the absence of good drainage, filth and water accumulate in pits and excavations, and emit noxious smells. The inhabitants suffer greatly from malaria, and as there are no good physicians in these villages, the death-rate among them has been very heavy for the last few years.

DAINIK-O-SAMACHAR
CHANDRIKA,
Oct. 23rd, 1894.

9. The *Dainik-o-Samachar Chandrika* of the 23rd October has the following on the subject of Sir Charles Elliott's conversation with the representative of *Black and White*:—

In the course of the conversation, His Honour vented his spleen on Mr. Caine and other members of Parliament, and said that if England ever lost India, it would be owing to Parliamentary interference. This is no new thing to hear from the lips of an Anglo-Indian official. Lord Lansdowne made the same remark, while the late Sir Ashley Eden used to call Parliament a dead tree. Indian affairs are now discussed in Parliament, and high-handed officials rebuked by it. And as Sir Charles is the most high-handed of all officials, he comes in for more than an ordinary share of Parliament's rebuke. So he naturally regards those members of Parliament who discuss Indian affairs there as the root of all mischief. It is his conviction that the more oppressive the officials will become, the easier will it be for them to hold India. Sir Charles has found himself in a difficulty for the first time in Bengal, for here the native press fearlessly criticises the acts of the officials. His Honour himself wishes to be the *ma bap* of the people in the way the older civilians were, and also wants all officers to be like himself in this respect. Now, the writer would have been most glad if His Honour and his officials had really become the *ma bap* of their subjects. Parents treat all their children alike, but these Anglo-Indian officials often make a sharp distinction between the different classes of their subjects. They show greater favour to their own countrymen than to natives, and among natives they show greater favour to Musalmans than to Hindus. And among the latter, they treat the educated with the greatest disfavour. How can then His Honour think of playing the role of *ma bap* to the people? He has no sympathy for the people in their distress, and instead of giving them aid in times of scarcity, he denies the existence of scarcity altogether. He punishes the innocent for the faults of the guilty, and the entire population of a village for the offences committed by a few among them. According to Sir Charles, the reception which the Bengali Babus meet with at the hands of Englishmen at home turns their heads, and they consider themselves as free and independent as Englishmen. The example of these England-returned Babus is having a very bad effect on their educated countrymen—an effect which is also being produced by their reading English History. This statement of Sir Charles really means: "The Indian people can never be as free as the English people, and can never obtain the rights and privileges of the latter. Nay, the rulers here should not allow them to obtain those rights and privileges. The people here should be kept down at any price, for English supremacy in India will be gone if they are allowed to raise their heads?" But why did not His Honour, who has the reputation of being a plain-spoken man, say these things plainly? To what is his lack of courage in this instance owing? Will he after all deny these words of his and play the same farce as he did in connection with his Darjeeling speech? Be that as it may, His Honour will have to give explanation to the Home authorities for what he has said in the course of the interview. Sir Charles' attitude towards the native press of Bengal is clear from his prosecution of the *Bangavasi*. It is therefore no wonder that he should say hard things about that press before the representative of *Black and White*. Again, in a country where a law was specially enacted by a former Viceroy to shut the mouth of the native press, it is but natural that its rulers should indulge in abuse against that press. Be that as it may, His Honour will have to leave the country a year hence, but the native press will continue to flourish his abuse notwithstanding. He is not the permanent ruler of the country, and his ill-will towards the native press need cause no apprehension or anxiety. According to Sir Charles nearly all native papers are hostile to Government and opposed to British supremacy in India. Now, if this statement had been made by any other man, he would have been called a liar. But Sir Charles is the ruler of Bengal, and so he must be regarded as truthful.

DAINIK-O-SAMACHAR
CHANDRIKA,
Oct. 25th, 1894.

10. The *Dainik-o-Samachar Chandrika* of the 25th October has the following:—

The Presidency Commissioner on the tone of the native press.

There was some delay in the submission of the administration report of the Presidency Division, and this delay was turned to the best advantage by Mr. Williams, Commissioner,

who was the author of the report. He had the advantage of reading in *Black and White* the Lieutenant-Governor's strictures on the native press, and he made exactly the same remarks about that press in the course of his own report. The other Divisional Commissioners whose reports had been submitted before His Honour's conversation with the representative of *Black and White* appeared in public print, did not say any bad things about the native press. But Mr. Williams was more fortunate inasmuch as he had the advantage of knowing the Lieutenant-Governor's views on the subject. But why blame him for trying to please his superior? He would have been a fool if he had not done so. Moreover, he has the example of Mr. Luttman-Johnson in the matter of the Faridpur famine to follow.

CHUNDER NATH BOSE,

Bengali Translator.

BENGALI TRANSLATOR'S OFFICE,
The 27th October 1894.

